



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,302	08/17/2001	Hennie Wesseling	BO44440ACW/S	6564

466 7590 03/31/2003

YOUNG & THOMPSON  
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

LABAZE, EDWYN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,302

Applicant(s)

WESSELING ET AL.

Examiner

EDWYN LABAZE

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2876

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of amendments filed on 2/13/2003.
2. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

#### *Priority*

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-8, 10-20, 23-25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatented by Pintsov et al. (U.S. 5,448,641).

Re claim 1, 10, and 27: Pintsov et al. discloses postal rating system with verifiable integrity, which includes means of making available a unique bit string also known in the art as a hash code (col.9, lines 35+), establishing an identification code (col.11, lines 21+); securely printing the franking mark on the document (col.11, lines 40+), said franking mark/postal payment at least comprising information relating to the bit string/hash values and the identification code (see Fig. # 4 of Pintsov et al.); characterized in that the string is selected from a centrally stored (through the non-volatile-memory) set of unique bit strings and that the unique bit strings which are made available for use are centrally registered (col.11, lines 56+).

Re claims 2 and 11: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, which includes means of securely printing the franking mark on the document as described above in step (c), wherein the unique bit strings and the identification code, protected with the aid of a first message authentication code or protected by encoding, are stored by a terminal on an information carrier 114 with memory (col.7, lines 53+), and the printing takes place after reading of the information carrier by a printing device 122 (col.8, lines 42+).

Re claims 3 and 13: Pintsov et al. discloses a system, wherein besides the unique bit string/hash values and the identification code, a terminal 112 identification code, protected with the aid of the first message authentication code or by the encoding, is also stored on the information carrier 114 with memory by the terminal (col.9, lines 3-67 and col.10, lines 1-35).

Re claims 4 and 14: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, wherein after the reading of the information carrier by the printing device 122, use of the unique bit string for printing a further franking mark on a further document is rendered impossible by the printing device (col.9, lines 54+).

Re claims 5, 15, and 24: Pintsov et al. discloses a system, wherein after reading the information carrier, it is checked whether the value of a counter on the information carrier lies within predefined limit, and, if this is the case, the value of the counter is adjusted after reading and step c is executed, and if this not the case, step c is blocked (col.10, lines 57-67 and col.11, lines 1-67).

Re claims 6 and 16: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, wherein upon execution of step c, use is made of a computer and a printing device 122 connected thereto (col.6, lines 46+).

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 7 and 19: Pintsov et al. discloses a system, wherein the identification code comprises a user identification code or a printer identification code (col.13, lines 24-48).

Re claims 8 and 20: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, wherein on the basis of the franking mark a second message authentication code is calculated and that this also is printed or the franking mark is printed in encoded form (col.10, lines 57+).

Re claim 12: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, wherein the terminal is arranged to send a copy of either the unique bit string together with the identification code and the first message authentication code, or the unique bit string and the identification code in an encoded form to an exchange (col.13, lines 36-67 and col.14, lines 1-58).

Re claim 17: Pintsov et al. discloses a system, wherein the system is provided with means arranged remotely from the computer 112 to send the unique bit string/hash value, together with the identification code, protected with a first message authentication code or protected by encoding, to said computer and to send a copy of said data to an exchange (col.8, lines 18-67 and col.9, lines 1-34).

Re claim 18: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, wherein the computer 112 is provided with means to print, with the aid of the printing device 122, the unique bit string/hash value together with the identification code, protected with a first message authentication code or protected by encoding, on the document, and optionally to send a copy or produce the same data of said received data to an exchange (col.8, lines 42+).

Re claim 23: Pintsov et al. discloses postal rating system with verifiable integrity, which includes means for receiving data (through the data center host 112) from an information carrier 114 (col.6, lines 12+), said data at least comprising of a unique bit string originating from a set of

Art Unit: 2876

unique bit strings (col.11, lines 21+), for compiling and making available for the franking mark for the document in protected form, so that said device can print (through printer 122, col.7, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 1-52) the franking mark on the document securely, said franking mark at least comprising said data as well as an identification code (col.13, lines 36+).

Re claim 25: Pintsov et al. teaches a system, which includes an information carrier 114 provided with a memory which at least contains the following data: a unique bit string/hash value, selected from a set of unique bit strings (col.11, lines 56+), an identification code (col.11, lines 21+) and a message authentication code/MAC (col.5, lines 40+) which is calculated on the basis of at least the unique bit string and the identification and/or the unique bit string and the identification code in an encoded form (col.13, lines 36-67 and col.14, lines 1-58).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 9, 21, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pintsov et al. (U.S. 5,448,641) in view of Haynes (U.S. 4,700,294).

The teachings of Pintsov et al. have been discussed above.

Pintsov et al. fails to teach a three-memory system.

Haynes discloses a data storage having means for compressing input data from sets of correlated parameters, which includes a three-memory embodiment 350, 360, 370 (See Fig. # 3B of Haynes; col.7, lines 15+).

In view of view of the teaching of Haynes, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate a triple memory system into the teaching of Pintsov et al. in order to provide more storage space and arrangement of different grouping of stored data. Furthermore, the three-memory embodiment would allow the system to specifically store the generated hash value combined with the identification code of the user into a different embodiment from the original memory, use another memory to correlate the stored combined data or parameters of the bit strings/hash value and the identification code with the centrally stored data as to verify and authenticate the legitimacy of the franking marks. Moreover, such modification would have been an improvement and an obvious extension of the teaching of Pintsov et al., therefore an expedient.

8. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pintsov et al. (U.S. 5,448,641) in view of Peyret (U.S. 5,688,056).

The teachings of Pintsov et al. have been discussed above.

Pintsov et al. fails to disclose a computer-readable, provided with software, which enables the computer to execute a method for printing franking mark on a document.

Peyret teaches a method for controlling a printer in order to print legitimate postal marks, which includes a computer-readable information carrier, provided with software, which enables the computer to execute a method for printing franking mark on a document (col.4, lines 58-67 and col.5, lines 1-67).

In view of Peyret's teaching, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the computer-readable information carrier or a compact disc with the software programming to the teachings of Pintsov et al. in order to

Art Unit: 2876

install/run a program enabling the processor to verify authentication, inhibit further operations of the machine when detecting forged document, validate legitimacy of printing of legal or frank marks, and deter fraudulent document/marks. The computer-readable information carrier may contain data or information to be loaded on the CPU for verification of the franking marks.

Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension of the teaching of Pintsov et al., and therefore an obvious expedient

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/13/2003 have been fully considered but are moot in light of new ground of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reisinger et al. (U.S. 6,148,292) discloses method for statistics mode reloading and statistical acquisition to statistics classes in the storing of a dataset.

Pintsov et al. (U.S. 6,385,504) teaches mail processing system with unique mail-piece authorization in advance of mail-pieces entering carrier service mail processing stream.

Leon (U.S. 6,381,589) discloses method and apparatus for performing secure processing of postal data.

Cordery et al. (U.S. 6,134,328) discloses a secure user certification for electronic commerce employing value metering system.

Pintsov et al. (U.S. 5,936,865) teaches a mail processing system with unique mail-piece authorization in advance of mail-pieces entering carrier service mail processing stream.



Art Unit: 2876

Leon (U.S. 6,424,954) discloses a postage metering system.

Pintsov et al. (U.S. 5,826,247) discloses a closed loop transaction based mail accounting and payment system with carrier payment through a third party initiated by mailing information release.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWYN LABAZE whose telephone number is (703) 305-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

el  
Edwyn Labaze  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2876  
March 11, 2003



KARL D. FRECH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER